

**FAEGRE & BENSON LLP**

2200 NORWEST CENTER, 90 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET  
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55402-3901  
TELEPHONE 612-336-3000  
FACSIMILE 612-336-3026

2754

**FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET**

Minneapolis Document Service Center (20th Floor)  
Facsimile No. 612/336-3026

2706

**THIS TELECOPY IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE PERSON TO WHOM IT IS ADDRESSED, AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION, OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.**

**Date:** May 27, 1998**Time:** 14:25 p.m. (Minneapolis)**Number of pages (including this page):** 2**F&B File No.:** 17310-203587**From:** Douglas G. Hodder**Telephone Number:** 612/336-3460**To:** Examiner J. Wolff  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**Fax No.:** 703-308-7724  
**Phone No.:** 703-308-3215**Message:**

**Applicant :** Robert B. Evans, etal.  
**Serial No.:** 08/861,530  
**Filed :** May 22, 1997  
**For :** HEAD SUSPENSION WITH  
RESONANCE FEEDBACK  
TRANSDUCER  
**Docket No.:** 17310-203587

**Examiner:** J. Wolff  
**Art Unit:** 2754

**FAX COPY RECEIVED****MAY 27 1998****GROUP 2100**

RECEIVED  
98 JUN -3 AM 9:22  
GROUP 2700

If you do not receive all pages, please call the Fax Center at 612/336-3932 or Karen Sonstebly at 612/336-3775.

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant :	Robert B. Evans and	)	Examiner: J. Wolff
	Todd A. Krinke	)	
		)	Group Art: 2754
Serial No.:	08/861,530	)	
		)	
Filed:	May 22, 1997	)	
		)	
For:	HEAD SUSPENSION WITH	)	
	RESONANCE FEEDBACK	)	
	TRANSDUCER	)	
		)	
Docket No.:	17310-203587	)	

4/4/98  
6/23/98  
n

**FAX COPY RECEIVED**

**MAY 27 1998**

**GROUP 2100**

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington D.C. 20231


**REQUEST FOR TRANSMITTAL OF OFFICE ACTION  
AND TO RESET THE RESPONSE PERIOD**

On March 26, 1998, four pages of an Office Action for the above-referenced application were mailed to Applicant. It is evident, however, from the fourth page of the Office Action, which is enclosed, that the Office Action includes more than four pages. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests transmittal of a complete copy of the Office Action.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully requests that the period of response to the Office Action be reset pursuant to MPEP § 710.06.

Respectfully Submitted,  
ROBERT B. EVANS and TODD A. KRINKE

By:

  
Douglas G. Hodder, #P41,840  
FAEGRE & BENSON LLP  
2200 Norwest Center  
90 South Seventh Street  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3901  
(612) 336-3000

Dated: 5-15-98  
M2:20172355.02

Serial Number: 08/861,530

Page 4

Art Unit:

A review of reference Fig. 6 shows the claimed combination of a load beam (item 9), a flexure (which reads on item 10), and at least one strain transducer circuit (item 26) on a head suspension assembly (item 3). Claim 1 recites no more than that. Claims 5-6 and 10 are also taught by the '424 reference and anticipated thereby. Merely review the reference 'head attachment region' as shown in Fig. 6 and the explanation dealing therewith. Also note the included strain gage (item 26) and the conventional operation thereof.

Claim 13, 15-16 and 17-20 are substantially coextensive with the claim already commented upon, or alternatively are taught by Hatamura and stand rejected for the above indicated reasoning.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-4, 7-9, 11-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatamura (5,142,424) in view of either Hosokawa et al (5,014,145) or Tokyuama et al (5,335,126).

The principal reference '424 shows the claimed head suspension assembly but arguably does not show the recited strain transducer circuit located on the load beam. The reference does